

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MR. CUTHBERT H. TURNER, M.A., delivered his Inaugural Lecture as Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford on October 22 and 29, 1920, and took for his subject *The Study of the New Testament, 1883 and 1920*, (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 5s. net). The lecture should be laid by the side of Professor Moffatt's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1919.

The year 1883 is chosen as the *terminus a quo* because in that year Dr. Sanday became Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis. And the year 1920 is chosen as the *terminus ad quem* because in that year Dr. Sanday died. For Dr. Sanday dominated the study of the New Testament throughout his professoriate. Long ago Professor Moffatt shook himself free from the Sanday influence and he has held himself apart ever since. But few others in this country have shown the least sign of restiveness under it. And whatever the future may declare, at the present time the feeling is almost universal that that influence, powerful and even dominating as it has been, has worked for good.

The influence was exercised both deliberately and unconsciously. Its method was partly the writing of books, partly the holding of Seminars.

'Equally significant,' says Professor TURNER, 'was his constant endeavour to gather younger scholars round him, and attract them to grapple under his superintendence with some of the problems which he thought most pressing in the sphere of New Testament study. The meetings were called by the German name of "Seminar," but Dr. Sanday disclaimed any personal experience of German methods: and indeed, when I call to my recollection the elaborate equipment which the Professor of Mediæval History at Munich displayed to me with pardonable pride—a set of three communicating rooms in the University Buildings, one for the Professor, one for the joint use of the Professor and his class, and the third a workshop, so to say, with reference library, for the students themselves—and contrast all this with our informal meetings in the Professor's dining-room, and the discursiveness of our conversations (but perhaps for that feature I was responsible myself), I seem to see an image of the difference between the English and the German temperament, reflected also in the difference between English and German output. But if the Seminar dawdled, and was not business-like, and mislaid its notes, and arrived at no final conclusions, I am sure that younger scholars received stimulus and inspiration, and Sanday would have held, I think, that that was better training for us than to produce cock-sure theses and print premature dissertations.'

The last sentence contains the secret both of Dr. Sanday's influence and of its wholesomeness. 'Perhaps Sanday was inclined to keep too many questions in a state of suspended animation; but that is better than the risk of premature burial.' Yes, it is better. And it is just because he refused premature burial that men recognized his supremacy and rejoiced in it.

But Dr. Sanday is dead. And the first thing that the new occupant of his Chair perceives is the necessity of a background for his study. Dr. Sanday studied the New Testament. Both in his books and in his seminars he gave himself to the problems contained within its pages, he gave himself minutely and unweariedly to their discovery and discussion. Professor TURNER cannot do that. He cannot even begin to study the New Testament until he has found a standard of comparison. That standard may be the preparation in Judaism, or the fulfilment in the Christian Church, or the background in the pagan world. It would be well if the student could use all three, but 'life is brief, special studies become more and more absorbing, and the essential thing is to have some one corrective to the dangers of a concentrated specialism.'

If Professor Kirsopp Lake has his way, the attention of students will be given to the pagan background. But they will have to set out with a smaller equipment of theory than Professor Lake carries and a greater respect for fact. Professor TURNER himself has studied most carefully the apostolic and sub-apostolic literature. And certainly in that department there are facts enough, new and momentous, to work upon. Professor TURNER gives a list of the discoveries that have been made in these forty years, from the discovery of the true date of the martyrdom of Polycarp, made by himself, to the discovery, by Dr. Rendel Harris, of the Odes of Solomon and the Books of Testimonies.

But the most significant thing in Professor

TURNER's lecture is its return upon the earlier opinions as to the authorship and date of the books of the New Testament. He restores the Epistle to the Ephesians to St. Paul. More than that, he finds no good reasons for withholding from him the Pastoral Epistles. 'On historical grounds I do not think it is too much to say that the Pastoral Epistles offer no serious stumbling-blocks. Even without them there is good presumption for the release of St. Paul from his first imprisonment at Rome. Internal organisation, in a church which had experienced such intensive culture as that of Ephesus, may well have developed as far as the stage implied in 1 Timothy. If there are differences of vocabulary, if there is in the writer a certain stiffness of mind which is not present in the Paul we know from the remaining epistles, is this hard to understand in a man whose nervous energy had had so many calls made on it and had spent itself in responding freely to them all? Read the catalogue of the apostle's experiences in 2 Cor. xi., add to them seven years of increasing age, anxieties, and infirmity, and you will surely realise that there might have come a time when even the magnificent vitality of St. Paul showed signs of giving out. At least you will realise it, I think, as you begin to get old yourselves.'

Again, the earlier date is taken for the Epistle to the Galatians. 'I have always felt sure that the mission of the "certain persons from Judæa" to Antioch in Acts xv. 1 and the mission of the "certain persons from James" in Gal. ii. 12 are one and the same thing, and that the vacillation of St. Peter preceded the settlement arrived at by the Council. But I used to suppose, with Zahn and St. Augustine, that while the visit to Jerusalem of Gal. ii. 1-10 was the visit to the Council of Acts xv., yet in Gal. ii. 11 ff. St. Paul, by a possible, though not the most obvious, interpretation, was harking back to an earlier moment. And I cannot doubt that if the epistle was written after the Council, the Council must be the subject of the preceding verses: St. Paul could not conceivably have avoided mentioning it, *unless the Epistle was*

written before the Council. And this is what I have come to suspect may be the true solution. If the mission from Jerusalem, flushed with its success at Antioch, had gone on to Galatia and there weaned the Galatian Christians from their allegiance, we can better understand the apostle's hot anger against this "quick-change" performance, "Ye so quickly remove" (Gal. i. 6), seeing that only a few months had passed since he left them. On this showing the epistle was written early in A.D. 49, and is the first of all his extant epistles.'

In the story of the Fall as we read it in Genesis there is mention made of two trees, the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil and the Tree of Life. Sometimes the one is made more of and sometimes the other. Mostly perhaps the attention is called to the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. But two passages bring the Tree of Life into prominence. The one is: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.' The other is as follows: 'And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So He drove out the man; and He placed at the east of the Garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life.'

Now it is the belief of Dr. W. O. E. OESTERLEY that in the original story there was only one tree. Dr. OESTERLEY has made a careful study of the doctrine of *Immortality and the Unseen World* in the Old Testament (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). Few men are better fitted for it. He is not only an Old Testament student, he is also a student of Post-Biblical Judaism and of Comparative

Religion. He moves warily, for the difficulties of the subject are very great; but he moves. When he comes to the origin of the belief in a continued existence after death, he finds himself in the Garden of Eden and in presence of the two trees.

He believes that originally there was only one, the Tree of Life. For the purpose of the story in its original form was to explain the fact of death. Death was, from the beginning of human thought, the great enigma, the great fear. And the conclusion was reached very early that 'an enemy hath done this.'

Now there was one enemy to whom all the signs pointed. It was the serpent. Did not the serpent cast its skin every year? And what could that mean but a yearly renewal of life? If this creature—so demonic in power and malevolence—had thus the gift of perpetual life, it could only be because it had snatched it from man. Man had been made and placed in a garden with access to the Tree of Life. That access meant immortality. But the serpent had entered and by guile had eaten the fruit of the Tree of Life and had left poor mortal man lamenting.

In this there is no mention of a Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Dr. OESTERLEY believes that that tree was introduced into the story at a later time. For it presupposes an advance in religious-ethical ideas. The story is still told in order to account for the origin of death. But now death is accounted for not solely by the trick of the serpent, but also by disobedience to his Creator on the part of man.

The difference is small on the face of it, but it goes deep down. It means that by the time the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was introduced there had arisen among the Israelites a sense of sin. So great is the difference that now the serpent could be dispensed with altogether. But it was not the way of these early historians to dispense with all that had become unnecessary.

So we find in the story of the Fall the Tree of Life and the Serpent, though neither has any reason for its presence there after the introduction of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.

The *Biblical World* and the *American Journal of Theology* have both ceased to be, and in their stead has appeared *The Journal of Religion*. Here surely is a sign of the times. Does it mean that henceforth the attractive word is to be neither Theology nor Bible, but Religion? No doubt it means that. And the new journal (which is to be issued every second month from the University of Chicago Press, at 4s. 6d. net for the British Empire) is nearly all about Religion.

There is just one article in Theology. It is little more than a note. And it is not theological. It is a statement, by Professor F. C. PORTER of Yale, of the work which is waiting for its worker on the interpretation of the Bible. Three enticing openings are mentioned.

The first is a new investigation into the origin of the ethical element in the religion of the Old Testament. The modern school of Old Testament science attributes the ethical interpretation of religion to Amos and his successors. That, says Professor PORTER, was natural, but it is certainly an inadequate account of the matter. 'Amos would not recognize himself as the discoverer of the truth that God is one who requires righteousness rather than sacrifice.'

It is a question in the comparative study of religions. So says Professor PORTER, ranging himself alongside the other contributors. The question is, How did Yahweh, the God of Israel, come to differ from Chemosh, the God of Moab? 'The blending of ethics and religion which is the greatness of prophetic teaching was apparently hardly more natural to the Hebrews than to their neighbours. Certainly it made its way slowly and

with difficulty through the new championship of exceptional leaders from one age to another; and the outcome in Judaism was only half a victory for the prophetic faith. But its champions did arise one after another, and found always some response in the deeper consciousness of the people.'

Present studies in Old Testament religion seem to Professor PORTER 'to be too much interested in emphasizing its likenesses to contemporary religions, and its debts to religions before and about it, and too little concerned to find the secret of its difference. The likenesses and relationships are extremely important. It was necessary to undermine a structure which rested on the assumption of the entire uniqueness and fully exceptional supernaturalness of this history. But there is a peculiarity which we do not find explained and a greatness which we do not find appreciated in many modern treatments of the subject. One reads them with general consent to what they offer, but with a sense that the real quality of the Old Testament literature and history is not in them. The tendency toward the ethical, the inward, the spiritual—where did it start? how did it work? how was it related to outside influences and how to varying tendencies within Israel itself? These are questions for the historian to answer; but his answer will be more likely to be true and satisfying if he is not afraid of wonder in the presence of greatness, and if he is capable of sympathy with man's endeavours after the unseen.'

The first opening for the student is in the Old Testament. The second is in the period between the Old Testament and the New. Professor PORTER wants a commentary on Philo. We have Cohn and Wendland's edition, and with it as basis we ought now to have detailed studies with translations and notes. Not of the whole of Philo—at least not yet—but of some of his more important and representative books. Professor PORTER knows only two commentaries that are worth naming, J. G. Müller's on the *De Opificio Mundi*,

published in 1841, and F. C. Conybeare's *Philo about the Contemplative Life*, published in 1895.

The third opening for the scholar is in the New Testament. It is a commentary on the Fourth Gospel. But here—'I confess that I am not hopeful about its coming. It will require a writer who combines rare intellectual and spiritual qualities in a rare balance and proportion; one who unites entire freedom with reverence, the equipment of the historian with the insight and sympathy of the man of letters. In fact the Fourth Evangelist requires a related soul as his expositor; and modern biblical science does not remove or lessen this requirement.'

But neither does it stand in the way of its fulfilment. 'There must be a way in which this spiritual Gospel can be set forth in its true character and in its real relations both to historical fact and to the inner life. I even think that this is a sort of test of modern New Testament scholarship, not of the truth of the historical method, but of the capacity of historical criticism to serve man's higher life.'

Is there no such commentary in existence? There is none. Professor PORTER refers to Edwin A. Abbott's volumes and to James Drummond's *Johannine Thoughts*. But they only provide 'occasional glimpses of the sort of treatment of this book which we would like.'

Two things are essential. First an appreciation of the spiritual meaning of the Fourth Gospel. For 'the words of this writer, like those of his Master, are spirit and life, as the experience of Christendom has proved, and in them it is not the letter that profits.' And next scientific truth. 'The trouble with those who have expounded the Gospel of John for its spiritual meaning is that they have too often connected these values with untrue judgments on literary and historical questions; while the historical critics have often corrected errors and provided facts, but remained

far from the centre of the writer's personality, and from appreciation of the things he really cared for and meant to convey by what he wrote.'

Is there anything in a name? Or a date? There is something in both. Use the name Jesus: there may be little of importance in it. Use the name Christ: there may be less. Do you say that Christianity came into existence before 30 A.D.? It is not Christianity. Do you say that it came into existence after 50 A.D.? It may be called Christianity, but it is not worth the name.

Those who say that Christianity began before 30 A.D., say that Jesus of Nazareth was its founder. Those who say that it began after 50 A.D., say that its founder was Saul of Tarsus. The former are interested in the Jesus of history. The latter are occupied with the Christ of theology. These names, they say, are not connected. Jesus should never have been spoken of as the Christ. The Christ should never have been associated with Jesus.

Of the admirers of Jesus the most popular and persuasive is Dr. T. R. GLOVER. Under the title of *The Jesus of History* he published a book which gave an exceedingly interesting account of what Jesus of Nazareth was in His day and generation. There was some expectation that that book would be followed by another. For, while some of its readers were well content with it as it was, others doubted if a good man, however good, was enough. The other book has come. Its title is *Jesus in the Experience of Men* (Student Christian Movement; 6s. net).

When Sir John SEELEY published *Ecce Homo*, he said: 'What is now published is a fragment. No theological questions whatever are here discussed. Christ, as the creator of modern theology and religion, will make the subject of another volume.' The other volume came. It was

Natural Religion! Dr. GLOVER did not promise a volume on Christ as the creator of theology and religion. But he knew that many of his readers were looking for it. He has published *Jesus in the Experience of Men*.

There are men living who remember their disappointment over *Natural Religion*—the disappointment and the amazement. Forty years hence men will recall their disappointment and distress over *Jesus in the Experience of Men*. It is Jesus still, and only Jesus; and it is Jesus this time in an impossible situation. As long as Dr. GLOVER confined himself to the Jesus of history he could write with a clear conception of his task, and he wrote very charmingly. Let no one say that to put his *Jesus of History* beside Sir John SEELEY's *Ecce Homo* is to make a fool of it. But when he came to say what Jesus—the Jesus who lived and died in Palestine so many years ago—has been in the experience of men, he had nothing before his mind but contradictions and absurdities. And even the simplicity of his style departed from him.

For if Jesus is only Jesus of Nazareth, if He is only the fine example of the Jesus of history, His influence in the life of men is beyond the skill of any writer to explain. There is Simon, son of John, crouching before the fire in the palace of the High Priest; and there is Peter the Apostle, defying the High Priest and all his officers: you cannot explain him by Jesus of Nazareth. There is Augustine—but what is the need for beginning examples which can never be exhausted? Jesus of Nazareth does not explain one of them.

And Dr. GLOVER knows it. In its very language the descent of the new book from *The Jesus of History* is remarkable, quite as remarkable as was the descent of *Natural Religion* from *Ecce Homo*. In taste and feeling it is even greater. Sir John SEELEY was never equal to such an utterance as this: 'If we spoke straight out, we should say that God could not do better than follow the example of Jesus.'

It is no wonder, therefore, that Dr. GLOVER should find himself unable to say anything about the Person of Christ. That he should introduce Christ at all, that he should speak of His Person as if there were anything in it, shows how impossible is the position in which he has found himself. And the adroitness with which he delivers himself only makes its impossibility the more manifest. He comes to what he calls 'the Christology of the Church,' and this is what he says: 'In Christology we begin to touch the region of theory, but the promise made to the reader that he and not the writer is to be the theologian, will be kept.'

Of those who find nothing in Jesus and everything in Christ, the most conspicuous for the moment is Professor Kirsopp LAKE. Professor LAKE does not deny the existence of Jesus. It is not worth denying. It was not Jesus that founded Christianity. If any man founded it the discredit is due to Saul of Tarsus. Nor had Jesus any discernible influence in its triumph over the Roman Empire. That surprising result is no surprise to Professor LAKE. It was due to the dramatic fiction of a theological Christ which had the luck to be produced at the right moment and to catch on.

Professor LAKE has published a book entitled *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity*. He is also joint editor with Professor Foakes JACKSON of a large book on *The Beginnings of Christianity*, the first volume of which, containing an Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, has been published. Both books are reviewed by Professor A. C. HEADLAM in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1921.

Professor HEADLAM points out that both books start with an assumption. The assumption is that the Gospels reflect the time in which they were written, not the time of which they write. They speak of events which are supposed to have taken place in the beginning of the first century. But there is no assurance that any of them did take

place. The historical evidence for them is of the flimsiest fibre. And, in any case, the writers of the New Testament who professed to write historically, neither had any idea of what historical writing is nor, even if they had had such a conception, could they have written historically, since their atmosphere was an entirely different one. They wrote as they thought things should have been in the lifetime of Jesus, not as things were.

In accounting for the rise of Christianity, then, you may leave out Jesus. Two processes are sufficient to account for it. 'The first was the absorption of the Graeco-Oriental cults. The conceptions of private salvation, of sacraments and so on were derived neither from our Lord nor from Judaism, but from the mystery religions of the Empire. The second was doctrinal. "Christianity became sacramental, and such in some districts, notably in Rome, it remained for one or two generations. But in Ephesus and possibly elsewhere a further synthesis was accomplished. This sacramentalized Christianity began to come to terms with Greek philosophy, as the other mystery religions tried to do."'

Now there is truth in this. Professor HEADLAM recognizes the truth that there is in it. 'Within certain limits,' he says, 'this has long been recognized by all Christian theologians; but there is a fundamental difference between the ordinary and, as we believe, the more correct view, and that of Dr. Kirsopp LAKE. The ordinary view is that Christianity, as we know it in its fundamental principles, came from the teaching of our Lord as interpreted by the Apostles, that it started with its belief in Christ, with its doctrine of salvation, with its sacraments and its fundamental philosophy; that then it used the formulas of thought, the ideas of the world around it to work out and express these principles; and that as time went on it was the powerful spiritual influence of Christianity which helped in the development both of the mystery religions and of the later Greek philosophy.'

The difference is radical. The Gospels, according to the ordinary view, tell us something of what Jesus said and did. According to Professor LAKE they tell us only what in the Apostolic Age it was believed that He said and did. How, then, do we know what He was or what He said and did? We do not know.

And yet Professor LAKE constantly assumes that he knows. He assumes, without a shred of evidence—for how can there be any evidence when the apostolic writers are untrustworthy?—that He never allowed Himself to be called Messiah or Son of Man. As for such a title as Son of God—it is not once worth referring to.

And what does it matter? Listen to Professor LAKE: 'The whole importance of this series of problems in the history of early Christology is often strangely mistaken. It seems to many as though the line of thought suggested above, which reduces to a vanishing point the amount of Christology traceable, in the ordinary sense of the word, to Jesus Himself, is in some way a grave loss to Christianity. No doubt it is a departure from orthodoxy. But if the history of religion has any clear lesson, it is that a nearer approach to truth is always a departure from orthodoxy. Moreover, the alternative to the view stated above is to hold that Jesus did regard Himself as either one or both of the two Jewish figures, the Davidic Messiah and the Son of Man described in Enoch. Both of these are part of a general view of the universe, and especially of a prognostication of the future, wholly different from our own, and quite incredible to modern minds. How do we endanger the future of Christianity by doubting that Jesus identified Himself with figures central in incredible and now almost universally abandoned forms of thought?'

It is an amazing statement. 'We do not doubt,' says Dr. HEADLAM, 'that this paragraph is one which pleased Dr. Lake enormously when he wrote it. It seems so clever; but when we come

to examine it, I venture to think that it will only really appear an instance of very crude thinking. Of course it is true that a time comes when orthodox belief is not expressed quite in the form of the day, and some parting from orthodoxy, or what seems to be orthodoxy, may be necessary in the cause of truth. But if we look through the long history of Christianity it will be apparent that there has been a real Christian belief expressed in various ways at different times, but fundamentally one. This belief has now, we understand, to be

given up. In fact Dr. Lake's statement about orthodoxy is one of those crude generalizations which appeal to the journalistic mind of the present day, but is really as destitute of truth as it is of sense. I think, too, we shall make it appear that his crude alternative between rejecting our Lord's teaching about the Messiah and the Son of Man on the one side and on the other hand accepting an untenable view of the Universe is equally a sign not of superior thought but of a sort of specious shallowness.'

The Problem of United Worship.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. DRUMMOND, M.A., ABERDEEN.

THE problem of united worship has always been somewhat perplexing, but it assumes greater proportions in these days of educated æsthetic taste when to so many the sermon has ceased to hold the predominant position. Most ministers endeavour to secure a certain degree of balance in public worship, and by a careful selection of hymns and readings seek to lead up to the discourse. Many, however, frankly hold that it is wrong thus to limit the thought of a congregation to one line, and their reading of Scripture, together with their praise list, is calculated to give general expression to various needs before the particularizing discourse is delivered. Neither of these methods overcomes the difficulty of the isolated sermon. In the latter case it is completely alone, in the former it is definitely the apex of the endeavour of worship.

Without saying anything which might raise historical controversy, might it not be suggested that the sermon has lost its real place of power? The spoken word on the part of prophet or priest would, at the beginning of religious ceremonial, call the people to worship, give reasons for praise, lead to humbling in prayer, and direct to passages of sacred story which might afford ground for confidence. The purpose of this article is to suggest that much good might be done, both for public worship and for the art of preaching, were the preacher from time to time to revert to the more spontaneous and natural method of earlier times. The following is one example of several attempts—which have been found more or less

successful—to cope with the problem in the manner stated. This service has been chosen as an example not because of its content and purpose, which is more or less educational and picturesque, but because of its form, which is indicative of what is desired, and because the subject may prove to be popular.

The Psalms in the Passover Experience.

Voluntary.

*Psalm 42¹⁻⁶ chanted by Choir. [Longing.]

Prayer.

Psalm 122.

[Journey.]

Psalm 100.

[Procession.]

*Psalm 24⁷⁻¹⁰ by Choir.

[Admission.]

Read Psalm 115.

[Antiphony.]

Prayer. Psalm 51¹⁻⁸, 7, 10, 11, 16.

Psalm 148 (2nd version).

[Liturgy.]

Read Psalm 126.

Psalm 124 (2nd version).

[General Thanksgiving.]

*Psalm 27¹⁻⁶, Solo

[Individual Longing.]

*Psalm 43³⁻⁶, Choir.

[Reassurance.]

Psalm 46¹⁻⁶.

[Eschatological.]

Benediction.

* Items unannounced; cue given to choir by organist.

This list seems rather formidable. In reality it is not wearisome. The congregation sings five psalms that every one knows and likes, and each singing is introduced by a few words on the part of the leader of worship. The desire is to carry back a present-day congregation to the atmosphere of earlier times, to stimulate such feelings as the Jew had when he approached the Holy City at the time of the Passover, and to do